



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The nature of the invention was discussed to determine whether there were any elements of the specification which could be added to the claims and distinguish over the prior art. The applicant explained the invention and reiterated the quantitative nature of the invention. The examiner explained that the invention was novel (free of 102 rejections), however with regard to the question of obviousness (103 rejections), the examiner does not deem the invention to be non-obvious. The examiner acknowledges that applicants are prosecuting the application pro se and has tried to be of substantial assistance, however is unable to distinguish the teachings over the art. .